

REMARKS

Applicants have received the Office Action mailed April 2, 2009. Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1, 18 and 19 to more particularly define the subject matter sought to be patented and to correct informalities, have amended each of dependent claims 2-4, 9-13, 16-17, 20-22, 27-31, and 33-37 for consistency with the amended independent claims, and have canceled claims 8 and 26 without prejudice. The amendments add no new matter. Claims 1-4, 9-13, 15-22, 27-31, and 33-37 are pending, of which claims 1, 18 and 19 are independent. Applicants request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-18 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1 and 18 to recite “a data processing system comprising at least one computer,” “displaying on a display device a view,” and “an electronic database,” and have amended dependent claims 2-4, 9-13, 16-17, and 36 for consistency with the amended independent claims. Also, claim 1 has been amended to recite “generating in the data processing system an output electronic file,” and claim 18 has been amended to recite “persistently storing the electronic business content structure in an electronic database.” The amendments add no new matter and are fully supported by the original specification (e.g., at FIGS. 1 and 2, and at page 7, line 7 to page 13, line 21).

Applicants submit that each of claims 1-4, 9-13, 15-18, and 36 is in full compliance with Section 101. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the non-statutory subject matter rejections of these claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-4, 8-12, 15-19, 21-22, 26-30, and 33-37 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,668,253 to Thompson et al. (“Thompson”). Of these, claims 1, 18 and 19 are independent.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the method includes “displaying on a display device a view that includes: i) the selected business database object in a first portion of the view, ii) at least some of the attributes associated with the selected business database object in a second portion of the view, iii) a plurality of business objects each having associated attributes, wherein each of the business objects has a defined relationship to the selected business database object in a third portion of the view, and iv) at least some of the attributes for the plurality of related business objects in a fourth portion of the view.” The amendments add no new matter and are fully supported by the original specification (e.g., at FIG. 4, and at page 15, line 20 to page 17, line 6).

Users of business tools may frequently wish to generate an object-based report, and may wish to define report content to include selected attribute data for a chosen number of business objects among a vast number of potential business objects within the system. FIG. 4 of Applicants’ original specification shows an example view according to an implementation of the method of claim 1 that includes a first portion 405 with a selected business database object 410, a second portion 415 with at least some of the attributes 420 associated with the selected business database object 410, a third portion 425 with a plurality of business objects 430 each having associated attributes, wherein each of the business objects 430 has a defined relationship to the selected business database object 410, and a fourth portion 435 with at least some of the attributes 440 for the plurality of related business objects 430. In this fashion, a user may be conveniently presented with a single display view that provides ready selection access to attributes associated with a selected business object, as well as a plurality of business objects related to the selected object and attributes for the plurality of related business objects, so that the user may be able to select desired report content in an efficient manner. Additionally, the integrated presentation of relevant content within a single view may provide the user with ideas for report content inclusion that she otherwise may not have appreciated.

Thompson discloses a system for enterprise information management. *See* col. 1, lines 13-15. A user viewing a report may right-click on a data element and drill down to a lower level of detail via predefined “drill paths.” *See* col. 8, lines 54-59; col. 10, lines 53-62; Fig. 6.

Claim 1 is patentable over Thompson because Thompson fails to disclose or suggest a computer-implemented method that includes, *inter alia*, “receiving, in a data processing system

comprising at least one computer, a user selection of one of the business database objects,” and displaying on a display device a view that includes: i) the selected business database object in a first portion of the view, ii) at least some of the attributes associated with the selected business database object in a second portion of the view, iii) a plurality of business objects each having associated attributes, wherein each of the business objects has a defined relationship to the selected business database object in a third portion of the view, and iv) at least some of the attributes for the plurality of related business objects in a fourth portion of the view,” and “receiving in the data processing system a user selection of at least one of the displayed one or more attributes associated with the selected business database object, and a user selection of at least one of the displayed attributes for the plurality of related business objects, and adding the selected attributes to an electronic business content structure of selected attributes,” as recited in claim 1.

By contrast, the displays that Thompson discloses as being used to define content for inclusion in a report do not include the integrated presentation aspect of the method of claim 1 following receipt of a user selection of a business object, and do not provide, in a single view, access to at least some attributes of a selected business object as well as access to business objects related to the selected business object and access to at least some attributes of the related business objects, as recited in claim 1. For instance, FIG. 7 of Thompson is described as depicting a “report creation wizard,” *see* col. 11, lines 3-6. Even if the identifiers “AVG DAYS IN STOCK,” “CARS IN STOCK,” “IN STOCK > 90,” . . . “MIN DAYS IN STOCK” may be considered attributes and the identifier “STOCK” may be considered a selected object, which Applicants do not concede, Thompson still does not disclose or suggest within the same view, display of a plurality of business objects each having associated attributes, wherein each of the business objects has a defined relationship to the selected business database object, and display of at least some of the attributes for the plurality of related business objects. FIGS. 5 and 6 similarly do not disclose or suggest this aspect of the claim. FIG. 4 shows a completed report, and is not concerned with report content definition or selection. As such, a user of the Thompson system wishing to define content for a report that includes attribute data not only for a selected business object but also attribute data for a related business object will not be able to do so from a single view, and will not be presented with an integrated display that provides access

to attributes of a selected object and attributes of related objects. With complex business systems that may include large numbers of business objects, and may have a large number of relationships defined among various of the objects, such a user may have to navigate several views to locate desired report content parameters, which may involve performing additional user actions and be more time-consuming. Thompson further fails to disclose or suggest receiving a user selection of at least one of the displayed one or more attributes associated with the selected business database object, and a user selection of at least one of the displayed attributes for the plurality of related business objects, selected from the single view, and adding the selected attributes to an electronic business content structure because, as described above, Thompson does not disclose or suggest displaying such a view.

Neither is claim 1 obvious in view of Thompson. For example, implementations of claim 1 may provide benefits not even contemplated by Thompson, such as displaying, in a single view, a selected business object and at least some of its associated attributes, along with related business objects and at least some attributes for the related business objects such that attributes of the selected business object and the related business objects may be conveniently viewed and selected by a user for use in report generation.

For at least these reasons, amended claim 1 is patentable over Thompson, as are each of dependent claims 3-4, 8-12, 15-17, and 36. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of claims 1, 3-4, 8-12, 15-17, and 36.

Independent claims 18 and 19 have been amended in similar fashion to claim 1, and are patentable over Thompson for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, as are each of dependent claims 21-22, 26-30, 33-35, and 37. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of claims 18-19, 21-22, 26-30, 33-35, and 37.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 13, 20 and 31 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of various secondary references. Claims 2 and 13 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and claims 20 and 31 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 19. As discussed above, amended claims 1 and 19 are patentable over Thompson, and the secondary references fail to cure the deficiencies of Thompson. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 19

are patentable over the cited references, whether alone or in combination, as are dependent claims 2, 13, 20 and 31, and Applicants request withdrawal of the 35 USC § 103(a) rejections of these claims.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that each of claims 1-4, 9-13, 15-22, 27-31, and 33-37 is in condition for immediate allowance, and request that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

This submission is accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination and the required fee. No other fee is believed due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2 July 2009

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
3200 RBC Plaza  
60 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

/Kurt F. Krenz/  
Kurt F. Krenz  
Reg. No. 62,664